

321 Hist. J. Angl. no 9

A.D. 494

A.D. 1897

THE
ROYAL HOUSES
OF
GREAT BRITAIN



NOTES ON A GENEALOGICAL CHART

ISSUED IN COMMEMORATION OF THE SIXTIETH YEAR OF
HER MAJESTY'S REIGN.

BY

J. K. BATHURST

THE COMPARATIVE SYNOPSIS CHART CO., LTD.

TORONTO

LONDON 1894

BUFFALO

H. JARVIS, de Québec

88 ST. LAWRENCE ST.

MONTREAL

Entered according to Act of Parliament of Canada, in the year 1897, by THE COMPARATIVE
SYNOPTICAL CHART CO., LTD., at the Department of Agriculture.

ONE great element of value to the historical student is that the history to which he devotes his attention shall possess such a continuity over long periods, as shall allow of the development of national character comparatively undisturbed by violent foreign influence, so that he may trace upwards from causes to their resultant effects. The history of no other country possesses this element more completely than that of Britain, and therein largely lies its value as an educational instrument. Its story written by practically contemporary historians reaches back unbroken to a period when the power of Rome was at its height, and the fact that at least four diverse nationalities each practising the art of letters, simultaneously recorded, the, to them, most noteworthy events in each division of the land, enables the student by comparison of these chronicles, to arrive with approximate certainty at the truth or otherwise of their narrative. The historian in most primitive communities was generally the tribal poet. In such a rude time, he was entirely dependent (for remuneration and position) on the patronage of the chieftain. What more natural, therefore, than that his energies should be bent towards the task of magnifying this chieftain's greatness and singing of his long descent? This we find to be the case in every instance, and though the years may be silent in every other particular, yet we hear always of the birth or death of princes, who to us are but the shadow of a name. On this unbroken chain we come in time to hang the few fragments of history which survive oblivion, and as the period comes nearer to our own, the habit remains, until the line of kingly names is the nucleus around which our knowledge of history centres. Keeping this fact in mind, the value of this chart will be apparent. It shows the order and date of succession of every monarch who has reigned in the Saxon Kingdom of Wessex, from which sprang Egbert, down to Queen Victoria. Also the line of Scottish monarchs from Fergus Macneac, the leader of the immigrant Scots down to James VI, who united the two crowns in his own person in 1603. During the long period of fourteen hundred years, monarchy has existed practically unbroken in Britain, and can be studied in all its phases; now as representing a deified ancestor by Divine right, now elective, again feudal, now despotic, and yet again constitutional. An institution so intimately

associated with all the struggles and attainments of a great people, must inevitably possess an attraction of supreme importance, and consequently a presentation of the facts relative to it must appeal most strongly to a nation which honors itself by the affection it displays to that illustrious House which represents the occupants of its highest dignity from immemorial time. In the following pages it is proposed to furnish the student with an outline of the facts which more closely relate to the genealogical history and succession of the Royal Houses, and in this manner provide a framework for the more minute details which it is his duty to accumulate for himself. Before proceeding to do this, an explanation of the chart itself will not be out of place. In looking at it, the broad column to the left hand contains the names of all the monarchs of Wessex and England, until the death of Elizabeth. The corresponding column on the right in like manner records the kings of Dal Riada and Scotland until James VI., who in 1603 ruled over both kingdoms, which his descendants have continued to do until the present time. The subsidiary columns and connections, shew, either the descent of important collateral branches of the reigning House, or are necessary more clearly to define the genealogy of the monarchs themselves. The deep red line indicates the direct descent of Her Majesty Queen Victoria and by following it downwards, her connection with the Saxon, Norman, Scottish and Celtic dynasties may be clearly discerned. The length of each reign is shewn by the space it occupies in the column, which is absolutely determined by the time scale which forms the border of the chart. The dates, (when obtainable) are also inserted. The coats-of-arms shew the development the Royal Arms have undergone from the Conquest until to-day, and in their peculiar language tell the story of territorial acquisition, pretension or loss, as forcibly to the initiated as can be done by more generally understood methods.

Although the line of descent is never broken, the monarchs are spoken of as belonging to different Houses at different periods, in consequence of the marriage of an heiress to a consort of another name, or for some other reason, which will be explained as occasion arises. These Houses are distinguished by change of color, and their names are given in letters of the same color, at, or near the date when the first monarch of the House commences his reign. With these few directions as to the use of the chart, we will proceed with our notes on the Houses, commencing at the bottom with the Kings of Wessex, and proceeding upwards with both English and Scottish Houses until

the Union of the Crowns, when our attention will be undivided until we reach the present day.

HOUSE OF WESSEX.

The piratical movements of the Teutonic tribes, whose homes were situated near the rivers Rhine and Elbe, were of frequent occurrence as early at least as the third century of the Christian era. So important had these become even at that time, that the Roman official, Count of the Saxon Shore, whose title clearly indicated his duties, was next in rank after the governor, or *Dux Britanniarum*. On the abandonment of Britain by the Romans in 410, these desultory plundering expeditions resolved themselves into a definite scheme of conquest and settlement. These tribes, although known by different names, were closely allied in origin, a fact which is emphasised by the genealogy of the kings of the so-called Heptarchy, who in every case claimed descent from a common ancestor—the hero god Woden. This fact is one of supreme importance to keep in mind while studying the period anterior to Egbert, as it was one which shaped the whole polity of the Saxon kingdoms and eventually led to their union under that king. Nearly at the close of the fifth century, an expedition, in all respects similar to many which had found a permanent lodgement on the east and south-east coast, came to anchor near where stands the modern Portsmouth. It was commanded by Cerdic, son of Elesa, claiming descent in the 10th degree from Woden. The district in which he found himself was a stronghold of the native Romanized Celt, and the progress of the invaders was exceptionally slow. The stubborn Saxon, however, held his ground, and overcame the British in several engagements, until, a strong re-inforcement arrived under the leadership of his relatives Stuff and Wihtgar. Cerdic being thus strengthened, succeeded in laying the foundation of the West Saxon Kingdom, and became its first king in 494. In 514, he associated Wihtgar with himself in the sovereignty, a position which the latter held in connection with Cynric, the son and successor of Cerdic, until his death in 544. From these small beginnings eventually grew the powerful state of Wessex, whose rulers were by a combination of circumstances, to become sole monarchs of all the Teutonic settlements in England.

It were a work of supererogation to recapitulate here the kings in their order of descent and succession, as that is given more clearly on

the chart than can be done in any other manner. We will, therefore, outline the chief movements which governed the succession and tended to mould the destinies of the kingdom. Placed as she was, with the independent British territory for her northern and western frontier, Wessex was given an opportunity of expansion, which was denied to the more easterly Saxon states; they being debarred from extending their area except at the expense of a kindred people. Unending wars also kept alive the old martial spirit, and fitted the west Saxon to grasp an opportunity when it was offered him. In the reign of Ceawlin the aggrandisement of Wessex went on rapidly. All the chief cities of the west fell before him as far north as Uriconium, near the modern Shrewsbury.

By these victories, Ceawlin gained the title of Bretwalda, being second in the list of eight kings given by Bede as having assumed it. The earliest was Aella of Sussex, by whom it was first used after the fall of Anderida (Pevensey), when a large number of Celtic Britons came under Saxon rule. The origin of the title is of considerable interest, being probably a reminiscence of the office held by that great imperial officer the Dux Britanniarum. It is certain that the Cymric leaders after the Roman withdrawal, were called "Wledig" from the fact that this word exactly translated the Latin "Dux," and it is highly probable that Bretwalda was in like manner a Saxon synonym for the Celtic "Wledig," as we only find the title applied to kings, who, by their extensive acquisition of territory, would naturally hold a large native population under their sway, so becoming Briton Wielder, or Bretwalda.

This was the farthest limit of conquest ever reached by Wessex, for in 584 she suffered a crushing defeat at Fethanleag in Cheshire in which Cuthwine and Cutha, the son and brother of Ceawlin were slain and many of her recent acquisitions lost.

But a most important change was about to happen to the kingdom. This was to be effected by the introduction of Christianity. St. Augustine commenced his missionary labors in Kent, A. D. 596, and from Canterbury as a centre, the new teaching rapidly spread over the land. In 635, Cynegils of Wessex was baptised with many of his people, and in a very short time the Pagan Saxon became the dutiful son of the Church. So strong a fascination did the monastic life possess for the recently converted men of Wessex, that we find Ceawalla and Ine, two of the most energetic and powerful of her sovereigns, resigning the crown when at the height of their prosperity and retiring into the seclusion of the cloister.

Kent had early fallen from the pre-eminence she once possessed and for many generations was under the domination of Wessex. On the failure of the Kentish Royal line, she had been governed by sub-kings of the house of Cerdic. This Kentish branch was prolific in distinguished members. Ceadwalla and Ine both belonged to it, as did Egberht, in whose hands at the close of this period were to be gathered the reins of Saxon government throughout the island. Between the years 494 and 800, twenty-one kings sat on the throne of Wessex, either jointly or alone. Of these, three abdicated; viz., Centwine, Ceadwalla and Ine: one, Ceawlin, was deposed; two, Sigeberht and Cynewulf, were assassinated; one, Beohtric was accidentally poisoned; two, Cutha and Cuthwine were slain in battle. The succession lay in the male line of Cerdic, the king being elected by the great council from among these males. This rule obtained unbroken all through Saxon times, and was only departed from when the nation was tottering to its fall in the time of Harold II.

SAXON HOUSE OF ENGLAND.

The consolidation of the Teutonic States of England was a process which had begun long before the time of Egberht, the Heptarchy having only existed in fact for a very short period. Changes had been continually going on ever since the settlement, and in the year 800 there were in reality but three independent Saxon states. These were Mercia, which was overwhelmingly the most powerful; Wessex with its tributaries, Kent and Sussex; and the northern kingdom of Northumbria. The political state of England was the principal factor which led to the supremacy of the Wessex king, and it is necessary to briefly outline it, properly to appreciate this important epoch in the evolution of our history. The ruling families in Kent, Sussex, Wessex, Mercia, E. Anglia, Deira and Bernicia, all claimed descent from a common ancestor, Woden, and in consequence of this fact, it had been accepted as a political law in all these countries, that although the fortunes of war might give a temporary supremacy to one kingdom over another, the monarch was never dispossessed of his throne, but allowed to retain it as sub-king, acting for the conqueror. The Saxon world presented an entirely new aspect at the commencement of the ninth century. A vast change had taken place in the territorial arrangement, and of more importance still, no descendant of the old royal line occupied the throne of any of the kingdoms, except that of Wessex. Wiglaf, an usurper ruled over Mercia, while Northumbria

was the sport of adventurers and the scene of wildest anarchy. Everything was therefore favorable to the aggrandisement of an ambitious ruler of the line of Cerdic, and Egberht proved capable of taking advantage of these opportunities. After reigning twenty-five years, he could with truth call himself King of England, (which title he was first to assume) and Bretwalda. The kingdom thus founded lasted for more than two centuries, with no break in the succession of his descendants, excepting for 32 years during the Danish occupation. It would be a task beyond that which we have proposed, to outline the personal characteristics of the sixteen monarchs of this period, and we would content ourselves with indicating the forces which led to the important dynastic changes shewn on the chart.

The word Norseman is one which overshadows the history of Europe during this period. From Dublin to Constantinople he carried the raven flag, creating dismay before and leaving a waste behind. First as pagan Dane, and a little later, when as Norman he re-appears decked with a veneer of Latin civilization, he is the ever-present factor which went to make or mar the reputation of these Saxon kings. Growing luxury and wealth had produced their usual effect on the noble classes, and Eadred, Eadwig and Aethelred II. were totally unfitted to lead against a fierce and hardy foe. On the death of Aethelred, so low had fallen the state, that Cnut was able to reign undisturbed and bequeath the throne to his sons. This Danish conquest, however, was hardly more than an episode and does not call for more special notice. Of much greater importance from its far-reaching consequences, was the marriage of Aethelred II. to Emma, daughter of Duke Richard I. of Normandy. This was the beginning of that intercourse with the race which was destined to overthrow the Saxon rule. On the death of Aethelred, Emma married Cnut, and by him had a son Harthacnut, who succeeded Harold I. During the Danish occupation, Eadweard, son of Aethelred by his first wife Aelflaed, had resided at the court of Normandy, and on his recall to occupy the throne of England, came over imbued with admiration for all things Norman. Alleged promises made to William formed the pretext for the latter's invasion in 1066. Eadweard died childless, and the direct heir of Cerdic's house was Eadweard, son of Edmund Ironsides. The Danish rule had weakened the idea of confining the succession to the ancient line, and the Witenagemot in exercising its right to elect a successor to the dead king, recognized that a strong hand was required to protect the country at this dangerous juncture. Its choice fell on

Harold Godwinsson, Earl of Wessex, who was by far the most powerful noble in England. He was of Anglo-Danish extraction, his mother Gytha being a great grand-daughter of Harold of Denmark, while his father Godwin, was a relative of that Edric Streona, earl of Mercia who had acted the part of king-maker in the reigns of Eadmund and Canut. Harold was made king, but his hands were too fully occupied with the sword to grasp the sceptre. He fell, after a display of unavailing bravery, on Senlac Hill and William of Normandy founded his kingdom upon the ruins of a Teutonic dynasty which had ruled in England for more than five centuries.

HOUSE OF NORMANDY.

As we indicated in a preceding note, the Norman was the most remarkable development which the Middle Ages produced; and in many respects he stands unique amid all the ages. In five generations the barbarous sea rover, during his residence in that province which he had wrested from the French king, had attained the highest pitch of the then known civilization and presented the pattern upon which all Christendom strove to model itself. He was the best fighting man in Europe and the exemplar of that chivalry which in spite of all extravagances, dared and did such remarkable deeds. Not Britain alone, but many other lands bowed beneath his mail-clad hand, but of all his conquests it was at once the most important and most permanent. Four kings of pure Norman blood occupied the throne in succession, using their power as they willed, unchecked in any way. The condition of the Saxon population was wretched in the extreme. During the usurpation of Stephen, they were ground between the upper and nether millstones, as the adherents of Henry and himself harried the land throughout its length and breadth. So bad was their plight that it was commonly said "that Christ and his saints all slept." But a brighter era was about to dawn, when a representative of their own royal race should wear the crown in the person of Henry II. It will be remembered that Malcolm III. of Scotland married Margaret, the grand-daughter of Edmund Ironsides. Henry I. fully recognizing the necessity of pacifying his Saxon subjects, married Matilda, the offspring of this match, and by her had two children, William, who was lost with the White Ship, and Matilda, who married the Emperor of Germany. On the death of the latter she married Geoffrey of Anjou, and Henry II. being the child of this union, united in himself the Saxon and Norman lines. The badge of Geoffrey was the broom.

plant, "planta genista," and from this fact Henry and his descendants are known by the name of Plantagenet.

The most important change effected by the conquest was the inauguration of the feudal system in its entirety, which resulted in the overthrow of that old system of land tenure upon which the Saxon constitution had been based, and created a privileged class who arrogated to themselves all the functions which had been the common heritage of the Saxon freeman, and left him bereft of the rights of a citizen until the exigencies of later monarchs enabled him to wrest back piecemeal some fragments of that which he had lost. The rule of the Norman kings was an unmitigated tyranny without a redeeming feature to soften its asperity. The long line of Plantagenet kings will see the beginnings of constitutional monarchy, small in themselves, but an earnest of greater things to come.

HOUSE OF PLANTAGENET.

This period is in many respects the most interesting and important of any in our history, as between the reigns of Henry II. and Richard II., the English genius commenced to mould the shape into which the constitution was eventually to be cast, and the nation's work in later times consisted rather in seeing that it developed regularly in the manner now laid down, than in materially altering its form. In the time of John, the nation fully realized what were its wants and aspirations, and embodied them in the Charter wrung from that king. In after days they no longer pressed for a return to the laws and usages of the Confessor, but boldly called upon the kings to fulfil the promises made by their ancestors and confirmed at their own coronation. At this time also was displayed in a marked manner the great absorptive power of the Saxon, which operated so rapidly that those Normans who could hesitate in the matter of a choice of rulers between the French King and a prince of Angevin race in the reign of John, had become so anglicized in the time of Edward III. as to glory in a war, the object of which was the annexation of France to the island realm. The career of foreign conquest which was the dream of all the energetic kings of this line, also foreshadows that later time, when in fields more distant than Scotland or France, the Saxon should push on from victory to victory until his dominion became world-wide in extent. But these aspects of the period, although of high interest, do not come so nearly within the scope of our sketch as to warrant a more detailed account. Genealogically considered,

the points of greatest moment are the decisions given by Edward I. in the dispute regarding the Scottish crown and the foreign marriages which were characteristic of these princes. We will turn our attention to the first. In awarding the crown to Balliol, Edward laid down as a law of succession "that, although a female could not inherit the throne, her eldest male descendant could do so; the rule of primogeniture applying in the case of the female." The abrogation of this rule, at the end of the period was the primary cause of the Wars of York and Lancaster, and will be explained in detail when we treat of these Houses.

The growth of the continental dominions of the English kings begins with Henry II. Already possessing Normandy, Maine, Anjou, and Touraine as a heritage received from his parents, his marriage with Eleanor added Poitou, Saintonge, Limousin, Guienne and Gascony to his fiefs. Compared with those of their great vassals, the territories immediately ruled by the kings of France were small in extent, less fruitful and less valuable. So strong, however, was the bond of feudalism, that no attempt was made to break away from the obligations it imposed until a shadowy pretext was supplied by the failure of a direct heir to the French crown. Edward II. had married Isabel of Valois, who was sister to Charles IV. In 1328, that monarch died without issue, and Edward III., as son of Isabel, claimed the crown by right of his mother, and as being the nearest male kin to the deceased; in this manner applying the famous dictum of Edward I. But he found no support in France, where an alleged Salic law was disinterred from among the annals of the Merovingian kings, by which it was declared that the succession to the French crown could not lie in the female line. Unable at that time to press his claim, the matter was allowed to sleep and Edward did homage to Philip for his continental fiefs. In 1337, however, feeling secure at home, he adopted the title "King of France," and by his invasion of that country during the next year, commenced the struggle known as the Hundred Years' War.

More valuable and permanent, though less immediately dazzling than the acquisitions on the continent, were the conquests of Ireland and Wales. The former took place under Henry II. and the latter under Edward I. Both territories added fresh titles to scions of the ruling House, the dignity of "Lord of Ireland" being first conferred upon John; and that of Prince of Wales on the infant son, of Edward I. about 1286. In summing up this brilliant period of our national

life, we would draw attention to the fact that the large measure of freedom which was the birthright of every Englishman above the rank of villein, was the great factor which enabled these monarchs to achieve great victories with such seemingly inadequate means. The vital difference between the armies of England and France, was, that with the exception of the privileged class of the nobility or chivalry, the forces of the latter consisted of a dispirited rabble who fought because they must, while in the former, although Edward might grasp at the crown as a French noble, each man at arms who followed his banner, drew his bow as in a national quarrel and for a land in which he had an inviolable individual interest. The deposition of Edward II. and Richard II. tends to show how little inclined was the nation to brook tyranny or incompetence on the part of its rulers. In striking contrast to this was the fact that the idea of the necessity of electing a successor on the death of a monarch was rapidly dying out. A tacit acquiescence in the rule of hereditary succession was taking its place, and though the maxim that "the king cannot die" belongs to a later time, we find son following father in the cases of the last four kings, without any questions arising as to the claims of other members of the royal family.

The reign of Henry III. which lasted 56 years, was one of the longest in our annals, having only been exceeded in duration by those of George III. and Victoria. We must now leave the Plantagenets with the deposition of the unpopular Richard, at which period the intrusive Lancastrians usurp the throne and pave the way for the sanguinary struggle of the Wars of the Roses.

YORK AND LANCASTER.

We closed our sketch of the Plantagenet kings with the deposition of Richard and the usurpation of Henry IV. The events which led up to this crisis are outside our province, so we will not enlarge upon them, but proceed to explain the complications which caused that period of civil strife called the Wars of the Roses. Richard III. being childless, the succession lay with the descendants of his grandfather Edward III. This king had five sons, all of whom left issue with the exception of the second. Richard himself was the only child of the Black Prince, therefore the children of the third son Clarence were the natural heirs, in such an eventuality as had arisen. Roger Mortimer was the son of Clarence's daughter, and in accordance with the dictum of Edward I., was nominated by Richard as his heir-

apparent. John of Gaunt, the fourth son, was the ancestor of the house of Lancaster, by his wife Blanche, while John Beaufort, Earl of Somerset, was the legitimated offspring of a liason between John and Catherine Swinford. The fifth son, Edmund Langley, had a son Richard who married the heiress of the Mortimers and so joined himself to the fortunes of the Yorkists. It will be at once seen that Henry IV. had no shadow of hereditary right, and although Parliament declared his accession legal, he felt the necessity of justifying his position in the eyes of the nation. In an early proclamation he stated that he occupied the throne "as descended by right line of blood from our good Lord King Henry III." That he was thus derived is undoubted, as his mother was a descendant of Edmund Crouchback, second son of that king. But as such an ancestry was insufficient to better his title, the absurd story was promulgated, that Edmund was in reality the eldest son but had been set aside on account of his deformity. However weak their claim by descent may have been, the two first Lancastrian kings were strong in other ways. The brilliant achievements of Henry V. in France, gratified the nation and enhanced the popularity of his house. There was no party in the kingdom strong enough to trouble a monarch who had eclipsed the most brilliant exploits of Edward III., and to whom the reversion of the French Crown was promised by treaty. But Henry's career, though a bright one, was of short duration; and in that of his son Henry VI., a series of reverses left the people smarting under the loss of all the French provinces. Still there was peace at home, as everything pointed to the settlement of the Yorkist claims by the accession of the head of that house, when Henry, who was rapidly sinking into imbecility, should have become incapable or should die, for in 1452 he was without a child to succeed him. Richard, Duke of York, was the most obvious choice as his successor, as on the death of the Mortimers he had inherited their claims, while on his father's side he was descended from Edmund Langley. His only possible rival was the Duke of Somerset, who not only labored under the disadvantage of belonging to the doubtfully legitimate branch of the Lancastrian house, but was also unpopular on account of the French reverses. But the birth of a son to Henry in 1453 shattered the hopes of the Yorkists, and two years later, despairing of obtaining their rights by other means, they appealed to the sword. Some early successes enabled the Yorkists to dictate terms to the king, and a compromise was effected in 1460 by which Henry was to reign during

his lifetime with reversion of the crown to Richard. This treaty which thrust her infant son from the succession, was disregarded by the queen, and the war still went on. Richard was slain at the battle of Wakefield, but in the hands of his son Edward, the rights of his house were in no danger of not being enforced. The victory of Towton, made Edward master of England and after a form of popular election at London, he became king. His marriage with Elizabeth Grey estranged many powerful supporters, and in consequence of obscure intrigues, which it is impossible to unravel, he was driven from the throne in 1470 and Henry was re-instated. Edward soon returned and the victories of Barnet and Tewkesbury, nullified the recent revolution. Henry's son Edward fell at Tewkesbury and soon afterwards Henry himself was murdered. Edward could now look everywhere and find no rival, and all seemed favorable to the long continuance of his dynasty. But this was not destined to be, the case for his son Edward perished by the hand of his uncle Richard of Gloucester, and this usurper himself lost his crown and life on Bosworth Field in 1485. All the blood which had been shed only placed the House of York upon the much coveted throne for twenty-four years, and the death of Richard was the stepping-stone by which the Lancastrians once more superseded the legitimate line. The relations which existed between the monarch and nation were not so favorable to the latter as during the reign of the later Plantagenets. A reaction had set in, and all the efforts of the kings were towards the evasions of such checks upon the prerogative as had been forced upon their predecessors during the exigencies of the Hundred Year's War. The tendency was always toward a despotism, and although every effort was made by the people to cling to their hardly-won privileges, the process still went on until in Tudor times hardly a vestige remained of those rights which had been their property under the Plantagenets.

HOUSE OF TUDOR.

The hand of Henry, which grasped the crown which fell from Richard's head on Bosworth Field, was destined to press more heavily than that of any of his predecessors upon the people over whom he was called to rule. The power of the great barons had always acted as a deterrent to the arbitrary use of the kingly authority but Henry came to the throne when the great Houses were fallen very low from the effects of the Wars of the Roses, and were in no position to withstand his persistent efforts to further lower their power and influence.

In this he was entirely successful, as by fine and attainder he utterly crushed the last representatives of the feudal system, and bequeathed a heritage to his son Henry VIII in which there were no other powers but those of the king and Church. This great institution shared the fate of the baronage at his hands, and the monarch became a despot, differing only from the Normans, inasmuch as he chose to carry out his desires by means of a show of legal process, instead of by the lances of men-at-arms, which difference was of no benefit to those who fell under the royal displeasure. In spite of the despotism of Henry and Elizabeth, it would be an error to think of these monarchs as unpopular, for both in their virtues and vices they were the reflex of the national character, and represented always that intense national spirit which was becoming characteristic of the English, since they had lost their continental possessions and settled down as a purely insular power.

Having thus briefly outlined the character of the monarchy during this period, we will turn our attention to the genealogy of these Tudor sovereigns. Their name at once associates them with a line of rulers, compared with whom the Conqueror was a man of yesterday. Among the Welsh a prophecy was well remembered; that a day should come when a king of Cymric blood should once more wield the sceptre of Britain, and this they held to be fulfilled when Henry VII assumed the crown. His mother was a daughter of that Duke of Somerset, who was himself a grandson of Catherine Swinford and John of Gaunt. His father, Edmund Tudor was of the ancient blood-royal of Wales on the male side, being the offspring of a romantic union between Owain Tudor and Catherine of France, the widow of Henry V. This ancestry, however illustrious, was of small value in adding the semblance of right to the occupation of the throne by might, and Henry at once enhanced the stability of his tenure by a marriage with Elizabeth, the heiress of the House of York; thus forever blending the rival families. The marriage of his daughter Margaret to James IV. of Scotland was in after years to effect the union of the crowns of that country and England. The matrimonial proceedings of Henry VIII. shaped the destinies of England during the reigns of Mary and Elizabeth, and were instrumental in determining the religious opinions of those queens. Mary was compelled to throw in her lot with Rome, as the Pope's refusal to declare her mother's marriage illegal was the only thing which made her birth legitimate. For the same reason Elizabeth was forced to cling to the Church of

England, as her submission to Rome would be the acknowledgement of her own illegitimacy. This fact alone governed all her doings with Mary, Queen of Scotland, who, in the eyes of all good Catholics, was the rightful sovereign of both countries and Elizabeth but a base-born usurper. As a matter of fact, both Mary and Elizabeth had been declared illegitimate by parliament, but a further enactment placed them in the succession, although it did not remove the stigma. Henry, by his last Will, exercised his power by leaving the crown in remainder to the children of his sister and Charles Brandon, Duke of Suffolk, a fatal legacy which led the Lady Jane Grey to the block. It will thus be seen that both Mary and Elizabeth reigned by no shadow of hereditary right, but by a purely parliamentary title. Mary was the first woman who ever occupied the English throne in her own right and thus broke through the famous ruling of Edward I. which had been so often adduced to support or overthrow the pretensions of claimants to the crown. Mary's marriage proved unfruitful, and as Elizabeth remained unmarried, although many alliances had been proposed, notably one with Edward Courteney, a grandson of Edward IV., the succession was open again at her death. So great, however, had become the power of the monarchs that her word was sufficient to guarantee a peaceful accession to her nominee, although he was of alien blood, and the ruler of a state so often hostile to England.

KINGDOM OF DALRIADA.

The beginnings of the modern kingdoms of England and Scotland present many features in common which cannot but be apparent to the most casual observer. In both cases advantage was taken of the retrogression of Rome, by the restless peoples who ever hovered upon the frontier ready to occupy her territory when unprotected by the legions, and in both cases these obscure intruders, after a long period of diverse fortune, suddenly emerge and figure in history as welding together the people of diverse policies into united and powerful states.

The middle of the fifth century saw the Eremonian Scots of Ireland triumphant over the servile tribes, and at liberty to turn their attention to other matters. The shores of Galloway were very near, and the temptation was ever present to the Scots to pass over and possess the land. The country was well known, and communication was frequent. St. Patrick, the apostle of Ireland, had been educated at Hwiterne (the Roman Candida Casa) on the shores of the Solway, and now Ireland was to repay Albion for her gift by

re-introducing that Christianity which she had lost during the anarchy which followed the withdrawal of the Roman legions. At the same time that Cerdic was steering his Saxons along the south coast of Britain, Fergus MacEarc, a prince of Dal Riada ferried over his Scots and effected a settlement in the south-west of Scotland. Like Cerdic, he was not long unopposed, as the Picts, who had been a name of terror to the Roman provincial, were consolidated into a powerful state whose lands extended from the Pentland Firth to the Vale of Strathmore. Beside the Picts, many detached tribes of Brythonic Celts were settled in the lowlands and promised to complicate the policy of the infant state not a little. In spite of all, however, the kingdom of Dalriada was strong in possession of those elements of civilization, against which, mere brute force rarely prevails. They were Christians of the Irish Church and the arrival of S. Columba in 563, and his conversion of the Picts in succeeding years very materially bettered the relations between the two powers. The Culdee Church in Iona, became a beacon light to the savage regions of the north, and in the quieter times which ensued on the acceptance of Christianity, Dalriada flourished greatly. During the period of prosperity enjoyed by the Culdee Church, the annals of Dalriada are no more involved than is customary to expect in an account of times so remote, but on the decay of this institution they become most perplexing and the greatest difficulty is experienced in unravelling the tangled skein. Careful study and comparison will, however, do much, and we present the list of Dalriad kings as the result of such endeavour, not claiming for it the absolute accuracy which belongs to the rest of our work, but as embodying the conclusions of acknowledged authorities on this extremely difficult period. Our list comprises 29 kings as reigning jointly or separately between the accessions of Fergus MacEarc and Kenneth MacAlpin, under whom the two monarchies were united. From the meagre accounts of the annals it is impossible to give details of their life or death, though it is probable that during the period of Pictish oppression in the eighth and ninth centuries, many rulers came to a violent end. The long line passes by, as shadowy to us, as those dim shapes which appeared to Macbeth, and "nothing are but names." Therefore it behooves us to leave this period and get upon firmer ground. The law of tanistry ruled the succession of these Gaelic kings all through this period and far into the next. This was an Irish custom by which the reigning monarch or chief, chose the successor upon his accession and associated this

successor or tanaist with him in the government. So deeply imbedded was this system in the national character, that even as late as the death of Alexander III. after generations of association with Saxon and Norman, the law of primogeniture was little understood and less regarded. The complications which took place on the death of that king arose from this fact. We must now consider the union of the Scottish and Pictish kingdom under Kenneth MacAlpin.

CELTIC HOUSE OF SCOTLAND.

The unification of the Saxon States had been accomplished by Egberht in 825, and a similar result was obtained in Scotland in 844. The means by which this was brought about in the latter country are much more difficult to understand than in the former. It would appear from the scanty annals of Dalriada that for many years before the accession of Kenneth MacAlpin, the Pictish Kingdom, then at its acme of prosperity had been paramount in the north of Britain, and the list of names given as rulers of Dalriada were mostly those of kings whose territories had dwindled to the narrowest possible limit. Yet we find Kenneth ruling over both Picts and Scots, having emerged from obscurity into the full blaze of power, and from this date the name of Pict fades from history. The very language has disappeared utterly, and it is probable that their position among the peoples, and the manner of their passing away must ever remain an enigma. Several theories have been promulgated as explaining this remarkable revolution; we will present two of the more satisfactory. In the Pictish kingdom succession was always in the female line; and it has been supposed that Kenneth was the son of the Dalriad king Alpin, by a daughter of the Pictish Royal house. This would account for his assumption of the kingly power over both peoples, as we know that previous Pictish kings were of British and other foreign parentage.

The other and more satisfactory theory is, that the Pictish element, although the dominant one, was never of overwhelming strength. A career of steady aggression through several centuries had brought many Celtic tribes into inharmonious connection under their yoke, and now a confederation of these, both Briton and Gael together, under the leadership of Kenneth, had been sufficiently strong to break their bonds, and during the revolution to annihilate the former ruling class. Be this as it may, the Pict disappears and the modern kingdom of Scotland is founded. The descendants of

Kenneth occupied the throne with but one interruption from his death in 860 until 1040. This interruption was occasioned by the usurpation of Grig or Gregory as the result of a revolution in 878, during which Aodh was slain. During the reign of Malcolm II. and Duncan I., the Celtic state began to feel the influence of Saxon civilization, principally through the acquisition of the northern part of Northumbria which had been ceded to Kenneth II. The innovations hence arising proved distasteful to the old Celtic party and the consequent discontent culminated in the death of Duncan and the usurpation of Macbeth, the mormaer or steward of Moray. Macbeth, besides representing the party averse to change, probably put forward his claim to the throne on behalf of his wife Gruoch, who was a grand-daughter of Kenneth II. In this way he would assert the claim of an older female line, Duncan deriving his right through his mother Bethoc who was married to the lay abbot, Crinan. At his death after a reign of seventeen years, a reaction set in, and in Malcolm Canmore, son of Duncan, Scotland found a monarch under whom to resume her progress along the path toward modern civilization. From the union of the kingdoms under Kenneth MacAlpin until 1040, eighteen monarchs sat on the Scottish throne. Of these five came to a violent end, viz., Constantine I., Aodh, Malcolm I., Kenneth II. and Duncan I. The system of tanistry fell into disuse about the time of Kenneth III. and hereafter, son follows father, but with no strict regard to primogeniture for two centuries yet.

SCOTO-NORMAN HOUSE.

The middle of the eleventh century was an important epoch for the Scottish kingdom as well as for England, but here the changes were not violent but gradual. Malcolm III., during the reign of Macbeth had been in exile, and on his accession gave full play to his admiration for the more refined civilization of the Southern Kingdom. He married Margaret, sister to Eadgar Aetheling, the grand-daughter of Edmund Ironsides, and consequently co-heiress with Eadgar to the Saxon Crown on the death of the childless Confessor. On the death of the Aetheling, circa 1130, her children were the legitimate pretenders to the throne of England, and of which the politic Henry I. was fully aware when he married her eldest daughter Matilda. The favor shewn to foreigners by Malcolm and his successors had an immense influence upon the destinies of his House and kingdom. Attracted by liberal grants of land many foreigners settled in the

country, bringing with them ideas and customs characteristic of that Norman race, which was then the most notable in Europe. Among these immigrants was Robert Bruce, of Skelton, a follower of the Conqueror, who received honors and estates, and grew powerful in the land. Two inter-marriages with females of the royal house paved the way for a descendant of this Bruce in the eighth generation to ascend the Scottish throne. Two attempts were made to arrest the spirit of change by Malcolm's brother, Donald Bane, who slew Duncan II., a natural son of that monarch and usurped the crown. But he was quickly deposed by Eadgar Aetheling, acting on behalf of his nephew Eadgar, after which the new order received no further check.

In the lowlands, at least, a great change took place in the relations of the monarch and the people. The old tribal system of land tenure was abolished, and the fortunate recipients of lands received them on conditions which implied military service. Alexander I. may be truly called a feudal monarch and the old Gaelic ardrigh was a thing of the past. Old customs rapidly died out, and gave place to the manners of the Saxon and Norman. At the coronation of Alexander III. the bards chanted the Gaelic pedigree of the king for the last time in history. It is curious to note, that as an offset to this the foreign settlers were gratified by the acquisition at great expense of the relics of a famous saint. Both Alexander II. and Alexander III. married English princesses, bringing a still larger infusion of Norman blood to blend with the Gaelic stock. This in the male line was fated to die out with the latter king, as upon his demise, his only direct descendant was the infant Margaret, Maid of Norway, his grand-daughter. Her death occurring while on the voyage to Scotland, left the vacant throne the object of a disputed succession. Had the law of primogeniture been long established, or well understood in Scotland, no difficulty could have arisen as there was no question as to the facts upon which the decision was required. The three chief claimants were Robert Bruce VI., John Balliol and John Hastings. These were descended from the three daughters of Henry, Earl of Huntingdon grandson of David I. Balliol was grandson of the eldest daughter Margaret; Bruce, the son of the second, Isabella; and Hastings, the grandson of the third, Ada. Balliol claimed as representing the eldest child, Bruce as being one generation nearer to his kingly ancestor, while Hastings desired a partition of the kingdom according to the old Gaelic law relating to joint heiresses. Edward, when called in to arbitrate, gave the only decision possible, but took advantage of his

position to exact such conditions from Balliol as made his rule an impossibility. After a short and stormy reign, the period closes with the ignominious downfall of Balliol, and eleven years of anarchy in which Edward made an unsuccessful attempt to annex Scotland to the English crown. Of the eleven kings of this period, one only, Malcolm III. came to a violent end, thus showing, that with the increase of civilization had also come stability to the ruling House. The great nobles had not yet acquired that power which proved so disastrous to later kings.

HOUSE OF BRUCE.

The Robert Bruce who became King of Scotland was grandson of Robert Bruce, the claimant in 1292. Having large fiefs both in England and Scotland, he was in the former country, partly as an unwilling ally of Edward, and partly as hostage. In 1306 he fled from the English court and, almost alone, reached the Scottish border. In Dumfries he met John, the Red Comyn, nephew of Balliol, who was now the representative of the direct line. An altercation took place between them and Bruce stabbed him to death in the abbey there. Having thus cleared his path of a possible rival, he soon found himself at the head of a considerable force, the country looking upon him as a deliverer. As one of the great nobility, he occupied a very different position to the gallant Wallace, whose family connections being only among the lesser gentry, found his plans for the deliverance of his country frustrated by jealousies arising from that fact. Edward I. marched at once to chastise his rebellious subject, but death overtook him before his task was well begun. His weak and pusillanimous son, after the disastrous defeat at Bannockburn relinquished all idea of conquest and Bruce was allowed to occupy the throne he had seized, in peace.

Robert Bruce left one son only, who succeeded him as David II, and one daughter, Marjory, by his second wife Isabella of Mar. David was childless, and during his lifetime the succession was secured to Marjory and her descendants by special enactments, so as to guard against the evils of a disputed succession. Marjory was married to Walter Fitzalan, the Steward of Scotland, the founder of the House of Stuart, and the child of this marriage ascended the throne on the death of David in 1370.

HOUSE OF STUART.

We saw, when considering the House of Bruce, that on the failure of heirs to David II., the succession was secured to the children of Robert's daughter, Marjory, who was married to Walter Fitzalan the Steward. The office which originated the surname of this illustrious House was one of great dignity and antiquity, being the survival, under a new name, of the powers exercised by the mormaers under the purely Celtic regime. These mormaers had acted more as allied though dependent chieftains, under the Scottish kings in more ancient times, as we frequently find them subscribing to foreign treaties in company with their over-lord. It was therefore fitting that a recollection of these bygone days should cling around the name of the most romantic and unfortunate of all the kingly Houses, and perhaps these very memories of the days, when the mormaer led the gathered clans against those men of Saxon tongue who now were all powerful in Scotland, was the potent spell which never failed to rouse the Highlands when a Stuart sought their aid. Be this as it may, on the death of David in 1370, Marjory's son, John, Earl of Carrick, was called to the throne. So detested was the name of the despised Balliol, that it was deemed wise for the new king to assume a more auspicious name than John, and in consequence, he is known in history as Robert II. In all, thirteen monarchs of this line sat upon the throne of Scotland and after 1603, on that of England also. Their history is one long romance, in which civil war, imprisonment, exile, and sudden death occur so frequently as to become common place. In the earlier reigns, the great feudatories were so powerful, that the monarch was hard bested to hold a place as first among equals. Then ensued a period in which the king placed himself upon much higher ground, profiting by the decay of the feudal system, which already doomed to pass away as in England, held its ground much longer in the Scottish kingdom. Then came that great theological controversy, which swept over the two kingdoms, profoundly affected both, but with widely different results to the reigning Houses. In England, the unscrupulous Henry, boldly turned the movement to his own advantage and wielded the new party as a weapon for the aggrandisement of the crown. Not so the Stuarts. With a tenacity characteristic of the race, they clung to the ancient faith against a people in arms, and were swept away towards death and exile, by a torrent they could not control.

A strange fatality dogged their footsteps throughout three centuries. Death either in its violent or premature forms seemed the common heritage of the line. Long minorities, with their consequent regencies, were frequent occurrences, and without doubt were largely instrumental in moulding the character of the race. After a childhood, which was the sport of contending parties, came the day of freedom, with its reprisals upon the hated and the lavishing of benefits upon the favorites. So also, when the restraint of the nobles was once cast off, everything tended to the abuse of recently acquired power and the assertion of a prerogative which was acquiesced in solely because of the impossibility of contesting it. And so, as actors in many scenes, pass before us these gallant men and brilliant women, poets sometimes, soldiers often, but all alike endowed with that personal charm which made men willing to die in their defence. But we must leave these more general topics to note the causes which led to the union of the Crowns under James VI. His ancestor, James IV had married Margaret, daughter of Henry VII, who upon the death of her husband at Flodden, contracted a second union with Archibald Douglas, Earl of Lennox. His mother, Mary, was the grand-daughter of Margaret by the first marriage, while his father, Darnley, was the grandson of the second, consequently James was great grandson of Henry VII.

In accordance with the Will of Henry VIII we have seen that the crown should have reverted to the Seymours on the death of Elizabeth, but without any other sanction than this queen's nomination, James peacefully occupied the vacant throne. Arabella Stuart was so nearly placed in the succession, that it was a matter of political expediency which caused James to forbid her marriage with William Seymour and when this took place in spite of his efforts, it is easy to understand the necessity under which he was placed of keeping her in confinement until her death in 1615. It would be out of place here to detail the events which culminated in the execution of Charles I, or the restoration of his son. The continued attempts of these monarchs to rule arbitrarily, and their concealed or open attachment to the Church of Rome, ultimated in their exclusion from the succession, by an Act of Settlement passed in 1701, and on the death of Anne the crown passed to the House of Hanover. Her predecessor, Mary, had reigned jointly with her husband, William of Orange, who upon her decease had occupied the position alone. Anne was the last of the Stuarts to reign in

England, and though the male line did not become extinct until 1807, the scions of this House passed their lives in exile, which was only broken by a few unsuccessful attempts to recover their lost heritage.

HOUSE OF HANOVER.

The Act of Settlement which we mentioned in our last section, was the most important legislative enactment ever passed bearing upon the succession to the crown and the position of the monarch. Parliament had now become so powerful that it was able to clearly lay down the only conditions upon which monarchy was possible in England. Provision was made by which all members of the Roman Church were excluded from the throne, and stringent clauses embodied in the Act by which England should not become embroiled in foreign war on behalf of the heir-apparent's continental possessions. The nation had become so imbued with notions of hereditary right that no action was considered, except to choose a branch of the ancient line, which would fill the conditions the people were determined to impose. The Protestant House of Hanover was decided upon as fulfilling all the requisites, and on the death of Anne, George, Elector of that country was called to the throne. He was descended from Elizabeth, eldest daughter of James I, who had married the unfortunate Elector Palatine, Frederick V. Sophia, the offspring of this match, married Ernest, Elector of Hanover, and was the mother of George I, by that prince.

Far different to the brilliant Stuarts were the earlier kings of this line, who were characterized by truly German phlegm and stolidity. Tied hand and foot by a contract not to be broken, they ruled as constitutional monarchs over a people for whom they felt no regard, feeling their enforced residence in England as an irksome accompaniment to their enlarged rule, and ever longing for the recurring visits to that beloved Hanover, where a surfeit of bourgeois pleasures awaited them. But in George III these Teutonic tendencies were dying away, and the family were becoming representative of the great country which had by its choice raised them from the position of rulers over a minor German state to that of constitutional heads of the most powerful nation in Europe.

Grave crises have arisen during the Hanoverian period, and the outlook has often been dark, but the causes have always been external. Strong in the confidence of a united people at their back they have stood alone confronting Europe in arms, and emerged from

the conflict with added honors and an enlarged empire. In consequence of the long reign of George III, his sons were beyond the period of middle life when they ascended the throne. The short reigns of George IV and William IV. covered the period between the death of George III. in 1820, and 1837. Neither king had issue which survived him, and the succession passed to Her Majesty Queen Victoria, daughter of Edward, Duke of Kent, fourth son of George III. In her person, we arrive at the end of the long line, and at a reign which in duration and splendor surpasses all those which preceded it. The sixty years of her Majesty's beneficent rule have constituted an era of unexampled progress and prosperity, in which the crown and people have equally participated. Every national advance has added fresh lustre to a throne which has its foundations set deep in the affections of a great people. A House which has been so inextricably associated with all the events of the national existence, that it becomes impossible to conceive of a combination of circumstances in which monarch and nation did not occupy their accustomed relations, seems destined to wear the crown of Ecgbert for generations yet to come, as the constitutional head of a world-wide empire.

A few genealogical statistics will not inappropriately bring this sketch to a close. H. M. Queen Victoria is the 47th in descent from Cerdic, king of the West Saxons, in which thirty-nine generations are in the line male and eight in the line female. Forty-six generations separate her from her Dalriadic ancestor Fergus MacEarc, of which five only have been through heiresses. She is the seventy fifth monarch counting from Cerdic, the fifty-fifth from the union of the kingdom under Ecgbert, the thirty-eighth since the Conquest, and twelfth since the Union of Scotland and England. Twenty-nine monarchs ruled over the kingdom of Dalriada and forty over Scotland from the consolidation of the kingdom by Kenneth MacAlpin, to 1603. Her Majesty is the fifth female to wear the crown of England in her own right. One queen only, Mary, occupied the Scottish throne before the Union.

NOTE ON AUTHORITIES.

In presenting a chart which deals with a period so obscure as that which precedes the union of the Saxon states under Eggerht, and of Scotland under Kenneth MacAlpin, it becomes necessary to state the sources of that information which we have attempted to reduce to chronological order. Careful comparison has been made between all the chronicles which have come down to us from Saxon times, and with Lappenburg's "Anglo-Saxon Kings" as a guide, disorder has given place to order and it has become possible to arrange in sequence the facts of this by-gone time. Some of the works consulted are given below.

The early Scottish records, both in the original and in the admirable translation by Ritson are the basis of that portion of our work. Of course instances have arisen in which much divergence appears even among accepted authorities, and in these cases we have accepted the weight of evidence procurable on either side, or made the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* the final arbiter. A notable instance is in the descent of Robert Bruce, in which some authorities substitute Adam for Robert II., and William for Robert IV., but we have deemed the evidence to support our view, and have consequently so embodied it.

A learned authority, not readily accessible, makes a serious error in regard to the descent of Ceadwalla, king of Wessex in 685. Ceawlin associated his brother Cutha with himself on the throne, and in later years his own son Cuthwine. Ceawlin had only this one son, who left issue Ceadda and Cutha. Ceadwalla was derived from Cuthwine through Ceadda, but this author makes him son of the associate King Cutha whom he calls son of Ceawlin. We only instance this to shew the extreme care which has been exercised in our compilation.

Among the works consulted are:—"The Saxon Chronicle"; Bede's "Ecclesiastical History"; The Chronicles of Aethelweard, Asser, Simon of Durham, Gildas, Nennius, Henry of Huntingdon, Florence of Worcester, Tigernach etc.; Lappenburg's "History of the Anglo-Saxon Kings"; Prof. Rhy's "Celtic Britain"; Ritson's "Annals of the Scots"; Modern Histories by Gardiner, Green, Ackland, and Ransome, etc.

that
otland
that
order.
have
laxon
come
f the

rable
ourse
mong
t of
nnica
e, in
for
and

or in
wlin
ears
adda
but
son
has

de's
n of
ster,
rof.
eries

LIST OF PUBLICATIONS SO FAR:

United States History (Wall Chart)	7 ft. 6 in. x 5 ft. 6 in.
Canadian " "	6 " x 4 ft.
English " "	7 " x 5 " 6 "
United States " (Students' Chart)	45 in. x 29 in.
Canadian " " "	38 " x 28 "
English " " "	36 " x 24 "
Genealogical Tree of the Sovereigns of Great Britain from 494 to 1897.	52 " x 17 "
New Testament History and Life of Jesus Christ	36 " x 24 "
Canadian Reference Chart	60 " x 45 "
American Civil War	50 " x 29 "
American Revolutionary War	50 " x 29 "



CHAS. W.